

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/679,353

Applicant(s)

CONRAD ET AL.

Examiner

Theresa T. Snider

Art Unit

1744

All Participants:(1) Theresa T. Snider.(2) Philip C. Mendes da Costa.**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 January 2004**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic



Video Conference

Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

49-57 and 74-81

Prior art documents discussed:

Stroud

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In a hope to expedite the RCE to allowance, Examiner contacted Mr. Mendes da Costa regarding possible claim changes. Examiner stated that claim 49 would still be rejectable under 112, 1st paragraph, as set forth in the Final Rejection of 3/3/2003, because it's believed that lines 12-13('passage...stream') is not readily supported by the figures or specification. To expediate the application to allowance, Mr. Mendes da Costa agreed to cancel claims 47-57 with the hope of possibly filing a continuing application with an accompanying affidavit stating that lines 12-13 are not new matter. Examiner agreed that an affidavit would be more persuasive then the remarks made in the response of 10/24/2003 however would not commit to whether that would overcome the 1st paragraph rejection. WRT claim 74, Mr. Mendes da Costa agreed to replace 'dirty air inlet' with 'nozzle' to avoid any confusion with Stroud who does not have a vacuum or nozzle structure. Mr. Mendes da Costa agreed to specification changes, as outlined in the attached Examiner's Amendment, to insert into words, which is supported in the figures, support for claims 75-81. It was agreed to insert #64 into figure 3, to be directed at the conduit below #66..